

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/832,416	04/10/2001	Wolfgang Bartsch	7108 US	9542	
7590 11/09/2005			EXAMINER		
Francis I. Gray, MS 50-LAW			DUONG, FRANK		
TEKTRONIX, INC. P.O. Box 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Beaverton, OR	97077	2666			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u>.                                      </u>		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)	- X			
		09/832,410	6	BARTSCH, WOLF	FGANG			
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Frank Duoi	ng	2666				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress			
Period fo	• •	V 10 0ET T/	S EVEIDE A MONTH	I/O) OD TUIDTV (2	00) DAVE			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	OATE OF TH 136(a). In no ever will apply and will e, cause the appli	IS COMMUNICATIO nt, however, may a reply be till expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed in the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Se	September 20	<u>205</u> .					
2a)[_	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)□	— · · ·							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Qua	<i>₁yle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from con						
Applicati	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b)[	objected to by the	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•					
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	·	=	<del>-</del>	7 7			
,—	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	Adminor. No	.o ano attaonoa omot		102.			
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	a ariarity und	er 35 II S C & 110/s	a)-(d) or (f)				
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document:  2. Certified copies of the priority document:  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document:  application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have beer ts have beer prity documen uu (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat nts have been receiv e 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	et(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	v (PTO-413)				
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Paper No(s)/Mail D	Date	•			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTC	J-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/832,416 Page 2

Art Unit: 2666

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is a response to communications dated 09/07/05. Claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

# Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informalities:

# As per claim 1:

Line 3, the term "may be" should be replaced with --are--.

Line 4, the term "being capable of being" should be replaced with --are--.

Line 8, the term "may be" should be replaced with --are--.

As per claim 2, line 2, the term "may be" should be replaced with --is--.

As per claim 3, line 2, the term "may be" should be replaced with --is--.

#### As per claim 4:

Line 5, the term "may be" should be replaced with --are--.

Line 4, the term "being capable of being" should be replaced with --are--.

Line 8, the term "may be" should be replaced with --are--.

The above terms have a tendency to make the subsequent limitation optional.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2666

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang (Protocol Compatibility Tester for CDMA Mobile Systems (CMS), IEEE, pages 96-101) (hereinafter "Yang").

Regarding **claim 1**, in accordance with Yang reference entirety, Yang shows a decoding device for analyzing communication protocols (*Figs. 2; section 2.1*) comprising:

a generic decoder (Fig. 2; PAST Interface Controller) into which a limited number of protocol descriptions (PDLs discussed on page 97) may be loaded, the protocol descriptions being capable of being interpreted by the generic decoder (page 97); and

a specific decoder (*Fig. 2; Machine (IBM compatible PC)*) designed for a certain protocol description (*page 99, section 3.2; RS-422 or T1*), the generic and specific decoders being reversibly connected so that the generic and specific decoders *may be* updated separately (see *Figs. 2 and 6 for connection details. There is beyond reason of doubt that PAST Interface Controller and IBM compatible PC can be separately updated*).

Regarding **claim 2**, in addition to features recited in base claim 1 (see rationales discussed above), Yang further shows wherein the generic decoder comprises at least one element function (system program) that *may be* overlaid by a corresponding element function (*HD64180*) of the specific decoder (*page 99. section 3.2, it is disclosed* 

Art Unit: 2666

the IBM compatible PC/486 can thus download to the HD64180 system program, which can be then be executed autonomously).

Regarding claim 3, in addition to features recited in base claim 2 (see rationales discussed above), Yang further shows wherein the one overlaid element function <u>may</u> <u>be</u> interpreted by the generic decoder (page 97, section 3.1, it is disclosed the PDLs designed for protocol testing).

Regarding **claim 4**, in accordance with Yang reference entirety, Baker discloses a method of setting up a decoding device (*Fig. 2*) comprising the steps of:

provisioning a generic decoder (Fig. 2; PAST Interface Controller) into which a limited number of protocol descriptions (*PDLs discussed on page 97*) of communication protocols <u>may be</u> loaded, the protocol descriptions <u>being capable of being</u> interpreted by the generic decoder (page 97);

provisioning a specific decoder (*Fig. 2; Machine (IBM compatible PC)*) for a certain protocol description (*page 99, section 3.2; RS-422 or T1*); and reversibly connecting the generic and specific decoders to form the decoding device so that the generic and specific decoders *may be* updated separately (*see Figs. 2 and 6 for connection details. There is beyond reason of doubt that PAST Interface Controller and IBM compatible PC can be separately updated*).

Regarding **claim 5**, in addition to features recited in base claim 4 (see rationales discussed above), Yang further discloses wherein the generic decoder comprises at least one element function (system program) overlaid by a corresponding element function (*HD64180*) of the specific decoder during connection of the generic decoding

Art Unit: 2666

0000

with the specific decoder (page 97, section 3.1, it is disclosed the PDLs designed for protocol testing).

#### Conclusion

 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Anderson et al (USP 5,850,388).

Vixie et al (USP 5,826,018).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Duong whose telephone number is 571-272-3164. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema S. Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2666

FRANK DUONG PRIMARY EXAMINER

November 3, 2005